UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,772	02/25/2004	Ross Bunker	BEAS-01437US1	2871

23910   7590   02/01/2008
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 CALIFORNIA STREET
14TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

EXAMINER
PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/786,772	BUNKER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael D. Pham	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 November 2007</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-11,13-18,20 and 21</u> is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of claims

1. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are pending.

2. Claims 5, 12, 19, and 22-28 have been cancelled.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 15-18 and 20-21, applicant does not provide antecedent basis for the claim

terminology "machine readable storage medium" and "computer readable storage medium".

However, does provide that a storage medium (media). See, applicant's specification 0069.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign
country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of
application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by US Patent 6874143 by Murray et. al. (hereafter Murray).

Claim 1:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"a user interface;"[col. 6 line 66, user interface. Accordngly, a user interface (user

interface) is suggested]

"a plurality of services, wherein a service includes a public interface that has an

implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension."[col. 7 lines 12-13, An

EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions.

Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs advantageously have an "open schema" which means that third party

developers can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating

their own tags. Col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements

can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes.

Accordingly, a plurality of services (tags), wherein a service includes a public interface that has

an implementation (open schema) and provides access to functionality in an extension (feature

types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes) is suggested.]

"a plurality of extensions to extend an application;"[abstract, various extensions can be

developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform.

Accordingly, a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application

(incorporation into the program or platform) is suggested.]

"wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the

plurality of extensions;"[col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags

that are associated with various extensions. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of

services (tags) is associated with an extension (an edf, implemented in XML, contains various

tags) in the plurality of extensions (various extensions) is suggested.]

"wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated

with another extension in the plurality of extensions;"[col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the

EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of

the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

"wherein one of the plurality of extensions provides functionality accessible in the user interface; and"[col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions (EDF) provides functionality accessible in the user interface (user interface) is suggested.]

"wherein one of the plurality of services provides access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions." [col. 7 lines 11-21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements, behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of services (tags) provides access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (EDF).]

Claim 2:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"One of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services" [col. 7 lines 11-21].

Claim 3:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension is an interchangeable application building block" [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers].

Claim 4:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description" [col. 6 lines

64-66, EDFs] "and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources" [col. 7 lines 63-

64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 6:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension defines handlers" [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously

enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.].

Claim 7:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a

user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information" [col.

6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.].

Claim 8:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"providing a user interface to allow user interaction with the application;" [col. 6 line 66,

user interface. Accordingly, providing a user interface to allow user interaction with the

application (user interface) is suggested]

"providing a plurality of extensions to extend the application," [abstract, various

extensions can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or

platform. Accordingly, providing a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an

application (incorporation into the program or platform) is suggested.] "wherein the providing

permits one of the plurality of extensions to provide functionality accessible in the user interface;

and" [col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For

example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein the

providing permits one of the plurality of extensions (EDF) provides functionality accessible in

the user interface (user interface) is suggested.]

"providing a plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of

services to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions;" [col. 7 lines 11-

21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various

extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements,

behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that

represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, providing a

plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services (tags) to

provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (EDF).]

"wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides

access to functionality in an extension;" [col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML,

contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs

advantageously have an "open schema" which means that third party developers can extend the

extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line

27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature

types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes. Accordingly, wherein a service

includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to

functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and

themes) is suggested.]

"wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the

plurality of extensions; and" [col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various

tags that are associated with various extensions. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality

of services (tags) is associated with an extension (an edf, implemented in XML, contains various

tags) in the plurality of extensions (various extensions) is suggested.]

"wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated

with another extension in the plurality of extensions." [col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the

EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of

the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with

another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

Claim 9:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"one of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services." [col. 7 lines

11-21].

Claim 10:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension is an interchangeable application building block." [col. 7 lines 25-26,

extensions can themselves be extended by other developers].

Claim 11:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description" [col. 6 lines

64-66, EDFs] "and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources" [col. 7 lines 63-

64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 13:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension defines handlers." [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously·

enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.].

Claim 14:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a

user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information."

[col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.].

Claim 15:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"provide a user interface to allow user interaction with an application;" [col. 6 line 66,

user interface. Accordingly, provide a user interface to allow user interaction with the

application (user interface) is suggested]

"provide a plurality of extensions to extend the application," [abstract, various extensions

can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform.

Accordingly, provide a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application

(incorporation into the program or platform) is suggested.] "wherein the providing permits one

of the plurality of extensions to provide functionality accessible in the user interface; and" [col. 6

lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF

can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein the providing permits

one of the plurality of extensions (EDF) provides functionality accessible in the user interface

(user interface) is suggested.]

"provide a plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of

services to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions;" [col. 7 lines 11-

21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various

extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements,

behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that

represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, provide a plurality

of services (tags) wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services (tags) to provide

access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (EDF).]

"wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides

access to functionality in an extension;" [col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML,

contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs

advantageously have an "open schema" which means that third party developers can extend the

extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line

27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature

types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes. Accordingly, wherein a service

includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to

functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes) is suggested.]

"wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; and" [col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of services (tags) is associated with an extension (an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags) in the plurality of extensions (various extensions) is suggested.]

"wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions." [col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

Claim 16:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"one of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services." [col. 7 lines 11-21]

Claim 17:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension is an interchangeable application building block." [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers]

Claim 18:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description" [col. 6 lines

64-66, EDFs] "and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources" [col. 7 lines 63-

64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 20:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension defines handlers." [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously

enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.]

Claim 21:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a

user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information."

[col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.]

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

A.   Applicant's mainly assert that "wherein a service includes a public interface that has an

implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension" is not disclosed. The

reason being that a public interface is a specific technical term well known in the art that does

not appear to be mentioned in Ali and further in view of the comments directed towards public

interface, claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references.

In response the examiner respectfully disagrees that the cited references does not

disclose a public interface. Murray discloses, col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML,

contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Murray discloses col. 7 lines

21-25, EDFs advantageously have an "open schema" which means that third party developers

can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags.

Murray discloses, col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements

can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes.

Accordingly, a plurality of services (tags), wherein a service includes a public interface that has

an implementation (open schema) and provides access to functionality in an extension (feature

types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes) is suggested.

The claims are still broad enough to be suggested by the cited reference. Accordingly,

applicant's assertions are unpersuasive over the cited reference.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Contact Information

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham
Art Unit 2167
Examiner

John Cottingham
Art Unit 2167
Supervisor

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100